REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending in the application with claim 11-16 being newly added.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in

view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 USC 101

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection under 35 USC § 101 has been

rendered moot in view of the recitation of applying the thin ceramic coating to the metallic

component. Reconsideration is therefore respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as

being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter

which Applicant regards as the invention.

Again, Applicant submits that the amendment to claim 1 for applying the ceramic

coating to a metallic component now sufficiently sets forth a step of the invention.

Claim 3 has been reworded to clarify that the ceramic coating of the present

invention is applied to an oxidation detection coating which in turn is applied to the

metallic component.

Deletion of the term "already" in claim 3 should be additional basis for rendering

the rejection moot.

Serial No.: 10/573,667 Page 4 of 6

As to the Examiner's suggestion that claims 8-10 are objected to for failing to utilize active process language, again, claim 8 has been amended to provide such active step. Reconsideration of these rejections is also requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Rigney et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,455,167). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that Rigney is directed to inhibiting the diffusion of metallic elements between the substrate which is a super alloy and the metallic oxidation protection layer which is a highly concentrated aluminum composition.

In contrast, the present invention is directed to utilization of ceramic coatings to prevent rumpling of the metallic components. As noted in the specification of the application as filed, rumpling, otherwise referred to as wrinkling, occurs as a combination of thermal and mechanical deformations occur essentially in cycles. Since Rigney is silent as to suppressing rumpling, reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

As to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of the Ulion reference, again, Applicant respectfully submits the Ulion is not concerned with suppressing rumpling of metallic components. Ulion is concerned with using aluminum oxide as a thermal barrier coating. Not only is Ulion silent as to any rumpling suppression, but, further, by specifically requiring the use of aluminum oxide which is known to have undesirable creep properties, this could serve to induce rumpling.

Serial No.: 10/573,667 Page 5 of 6

As to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of the Lorimar reference,

again, Applicant submits that Lorimar is interested in utilizing aluminum oxide for

improving corrosion resistance in aluminum and is in no way concerned with

suppressing rumpling. If indeed Lorimar was to be utilized as a rumpling suppression

composition, the creep properties would be detrimental.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly

traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests

that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is

believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office

Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and

favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner

believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the

Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 12, 2008

By: /Robert M. Siminski/

Robert M. Siminski

Reg. No. 36007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.

P.O. Box 828

Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303

(248) 641-1600

RMS/jao

Page 6 of 6 Serial No.: 10/573,667